APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg	NL040009	5252

24737   7590   01/20/2011
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
JOHN, CLARENCE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/20/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/597,047	BRONNENBERG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLARENCE JOHN	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 November 2010</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>13-27</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>13-27</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20110103

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

This action is responsive to Communication filed on November 2, 2010. Claims 13-27 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/2/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for allowance.

2. With respect to Claims 13 and 25, the Applicant argues that Pham does not teach filtering of information about content and that the filtering in Pham refers to SA parameter data and this SA parameter data is not the information about content.

3. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Pham does teach the above limitation. (Figure 1, Figure 2, Page 3 – paragraph [0036], paragraph [0038], Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); Pham teaches a Network Infrastructure to perform a variety of operations to maintain the smooth flow of network traffic through the Internet and private Intranets. Pham also teaches processors performing filtering and routing of network data packets received at the network connections to the local area network as well as the Internet. The network data packet is the content.

These filtering and routing of network data packets or contents are performed by network processors. The network processors include a high speed memory providing a dynamic data store for accumulated routing and filtered information. The routing of filtered content or network data is stored in the dynamic data store. The filtered data in the data store includes SA parameter data which is associated with the network data packets or contents and load balancing distribution of data packets occur. (Page 4 – paragraph [0043] right column lines 1-11).

4. With respect to Claims 13 and 25, the Applicant also argues that none of the references teaches periodic filtering information about the content to yield filtered information that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices.

5. **In reply,** the Examiner states that the combination of Pham and Hughes teach the above limitation. Pham teaches filtering information about the content to yield filtered information as described above. Pham also teaches filtering of content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19). These filtering and routing of network data packets or contents are performed by network processors. The network processors include a high speed memory providing a dynamic data store for accumulated routing and filtered information.

The filtered data content is explicitly provided by the network rendering device - control processor 84, which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92. Thus, Pham teaches filtering information about the content to yield filtered information that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices as described above. However, Pham does not explicitly state about periodic filtering. Conversely, Hughes does teach periodic filtering. Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-39, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10). Here Hughes teaches periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor within the scan interval of 5 minutes as depicted in Figure 10. The scan and filter functions are checked in the Proxy monitor configuration and the scan interval is set to 5 minutes. This means that the content is filtered every 5 minutes and the events are logged and notified to pelswick@va-village.com who can access the periodic filtered content.

6. Pham and Hughes have common grounds of filtering information on servers and devices. According to the Supreme Court Decision in **KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.**, 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique (Rationale C.) such as filtering which Hughes teaches in the same way with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users .

7. With respect to dependent Claim 14, though the Applicant agrees that
   Abdulrahiman teaches the existence of content having a format that is
   incompatible with a particular electronic device, the Applicant argues that
   Abdulrahiman does not teach periodic filtering of content that cannot be rendered
   by at least one network rendering device.

8. **In reply,** the Examiner states that Abdulrahiman was relied upon teaching only
   the content having a format that is incompatible with a particular electronic device
   and Abdulrahiman was not relied upon teaching periodic filtering of content that
   cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device. This limitation is
   taught by the combination of Pham and Hughes as described above in Claim 13.

9. Pham, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the
   servers and devices. According to the Supreme Court Decision in **KSR
   International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.**, 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it
   would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique (Rationale C.)
   which Abdulrahiman teaches with Pham and Hughes in order to prevent certain
   data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain
   supported data formats.

10. With respect to dependent Claim 16, the Applicant argues that Safadi does not
    teach periodic filtering information about the content that cannot be rendered by
    at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering

devices comprising a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

11. **In reply,** the Examiner states that the combination of Pham and Hughes teach periodic filtering information about the content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices as described above with respect to Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices. Conversely, Safadi does teach this limitation. Safadi teaches methods and apparatus for Digital Rights Management (DRM). (See Abstract). In another embodiment, Safadi teaches about a content having a DRM scheme or system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices (Page 3 – paragraph [0038] lines 2-7, Network device 200 - Figure 1). Here the original DRM scheme of a particular content is converted to a native DRM scheme only if the consumer's Network device 200 is not compatible or not supported.

12. Examiner notes that no new matter has been added and that the claims are rejected based on the same references as cited by the previous office action.

13. Applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty in view of the state of

the art disclosed by the references cited that would overcome the 103(a)

rejections applied against the claims, the rejection is therefore sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time
> the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter
> pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-12. are Cancelled.

15. Claims 13, 15, 17, 19, and 22 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Pham et al. (US 2003/0074473) in view of Hughes et al. (US

6,065,055).

16. With respect to Claim 13, Pham teaches a method of filtering and storing

information about content stored on at least one network device and accessible

via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network

rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprising the

steps of : filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid

of information about content (Figure 1, Figure 2, Page 3 – paragraph [0036],

paragraph [0038], Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12) that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92); storing in a content directory the filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6); and searching or browsing the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device; (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19);

17. wherein said searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device is performed independently (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which is performed independently)

18. Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However, Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

19. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is

the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor. The scan and
filter functions are checked in the Proxy monitor configuration and the scan
interval is set to 5 minutes.

20. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It
would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in
order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the
unapproved sites from the users.

21. With respect to Claim 15, Pham and Hughes teach the method as claimed in
Claim 13, wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network
rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices (Pham - Page 5,
paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control
processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92)
comprises content having a transport protocol that is not compatible with the at
least one network rendering device. (Pham - Page 5 paragraph [0050] lines 1-12,
lines 19-12. Here, IPsec protocol is the transport protocol used to transfer
packets to crypto processor 86 which is not compatible with one network device)

22. With respect to Claim 17, Pham and Hughes teach the limitation as described in
Claim 13 above. However, Pham does not explicitly state about said periodic

filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of
information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network
rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is repeated over a
"predefined time interval".

23. Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Hughe's teachings on
Figure 10, Scan Interval of 5 minutes).

24. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It
would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in
order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the
unapproved sites from the users.

25. With respect to Claim 19, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in
claim 13 wherein said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield
filtered information devoid of information about   content that cannot be rendered
by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering
devices is performed where a new network rendering device is added to the
network.   (Pham's teachings on Figure 1, Page 3 – paragraph [0039] lines 8-12.
Here, the establishment of new network connection includes the remote gateway
20).

26. With respect to Claim 22, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in
    claim 13, further comprising selecting content for transfer via the network to the
    at least one network rendering device, (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines
    19-22); wherein said selecting is based on the searching or browsing step,
    (Pham - Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and wherein said content
    selected for transfer is renderable by the at least one network rendering device.
    (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0052] lines 1-4).

27. With respect to Claim 23,Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in claim
    13 wherein said method further comprises the step of : filtering information about
    the content to yield filtered information including content (Pham - Page 5,
    paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by at least one network
    rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices, (Pham - Page 5,
    paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control
    processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92);
    and making available on the network said filtered information including content
    that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device. (Pham Page
    5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]. The stored information is available on the
    network).

28. Pham and Hughes teach the limitation of Claim 23 as described above.
    However, Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

29. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

30. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

31. With respect to Claim 24, Pham and Hughes teach a method as claimed in claim 23, wherein said method further comprises the step of : initiating an action based on said filtered information including information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device, wherein the action comprises **any** of the following: upgrading the network; b) downloading and/or installing a codec; c) adapting a security parameter; (Pham - Page 1 – paragraph [0008] lines 1-10, Page – paragraph [0039] lines 18-22) d) recommending the purchase or upgrade of at least one network rendering device; and e) providing a human-perceptible explanation of why content is unusable by the at least one network rendering device.

32. With respect to Claim 25, Pham teaches a device adapted for filtering and
storing information about content accessible via a network, said content being
potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering device adapted for
rendering content, the device comprising: a) at least one filtering element
adapted to filter information about the content to yield filtered information devoid
of content ((Figure 1, Figure 2, Page 3 – paragraph [0036], paragraph [0038],
Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12) that cannot be rendered by at least one
network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5,
paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control
processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92);
and b) a storage element containing a content directory including the filtered
information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by said
at least one network rendering device (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]);

33. wherein the content directory is searchable or browseable to enable review of
said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least
one network rendering device, (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8, paragraph
[0068] lines 14-19); and searching or browsing of the content directory to review
said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be
rendered by the at least one network rendering device is performed
independently of said periodic filtering by the at least one filtering element. (Page
5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the

control processor 84 which is performed independently); to yield filtered

information devoid of information about   content (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines

1-12);   that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device.

(Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the

control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network

processor 92).

34. Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 25 as described above. However, Pham

     does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

35. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.

     (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-

     17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes.   i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is

     the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes

     further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-

     57. i.e. filtering the information).

36. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It

     would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

     invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in

     order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the

     unapproved sites from the users.

37. With respect to Claim 26, Pham and Hughes teach a media server embodying the device of claim 25. (Pham - Figure 1, Page 1 – paragraph [0009] lines 3-8).

38. With respect to Claim 27, Pham and Hughes teach a network comprising the device of claim 25 (Pham - Figure 1); and at least one network rendering device (Pham -Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84).

39. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham and Hughes in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US 2003/0023671)

40. With respect to Claim 14, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

41. Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5).

42. Pham, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of

Abdulrahiman with Pham and Hughes in order to prevent certain data

information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain

supported data formats.

43. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham

and Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

44. With respect to Claim 16, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described

in Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching

a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which

is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

45. Conversely Safadi does in fact teach such a limitation. In one embodiment,

Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights

Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2,

paragraph [0021, lines 1-2). In another embodiment, Safadi teaches about a

content having a DRM scheme or system, which is not supported by any of the

network rendering devices (Page 3 – paragraph [0038] lines 2-7, Network device

200 - Figure 1). Here the original DRM scheme of a particular content is

converted to a native DRM scheme only if the consumer's Network device 200 is

not compatible or not supported.

46. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and

devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Pham and Hughes in

order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of

content.

47. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Pham and Hughes in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).

48. With respect to Claim 18, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described

in Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching

a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from

the network.

49. Conversely Gorman teaches the above limitation. Gorman teaches a system

and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content

which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the

network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here

Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

50. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and

devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham and

Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

51. With respect to Claim 20, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Also, Pham and Hughes teach a method of filtering (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); and storing information about content is performed (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6); for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).

52. However Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about filtering which is performed when a network device has been removed.

53. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

54. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

55. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham
   and Hughes in further view of Phan et al. (US 2004/0193609).

56. With respect to Claim 21, Pham and Hughes teach the limitations as described in
   Claim 13. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings
   wherein the network is a UPnP network and the information about the content is
   stored by an UPnP content directory service.

57. Conversely Phan does in fact teach such a limitation. Phan teaches a master
   content directory service representing all of the content within the network.
   (Abstract lines 1-3). Phan also teaches a UPnP architecture defining general
   interaction between UPnP control points and UPnP network devices (Page 2 –
   paragraph [0020], Page 3 - paragraph [0024]); and the information about content
   is stored by an UPnP content directory service Page 2 – paragraph [0020] lines
   12-16, Page 5 – paragraph [0040] lines 7-12).

58. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and
   devices over a network. Phan also teaches storing information content in a
   communication network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill
   in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of
   Phan with Pham and Hughes employing a UPnP network which is self
   configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and
   controlling other devices.

Conclusion

The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and /or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its corresponding support in the specification.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443
1/5/2011

/Tonia LM Dollinger/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443